

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 are pending. Claims 5-8 and 12-22 are canceled.

The specification is objected to because the Abstract exceeds 150 words. The Abstract has been amended to overcome this objection.

Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Each of these claims has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,535,146 to Chang et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Independent claims 1 and 9 recite limitations that are not disclosed in the Chang reference. For example, independent claims 1 and 9 recite “a test control bus operable to provide test signals to [the] scan logic” and “a general purpose input-output (GPIO) module operable to provide said a plurality of test signals to said scan logic via said test control bus.” Examiner asserts that these limitations are anticipated by column 32, lines 36 et seq. of Chang (pg. 2 of Office Action) and column 2, lines 35 et seq. of Chang (pg. 3 of Office Action). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Chang do not disclose the aforementioned limitations. Specifically, the cited portions of Chang do not disclose a control bus. Furthermore, the cited portions of Chang do not disclose a general purpose input-output (GPIO) module as that term would be understood by those of skill in the art. Therefore, the cited portion of Chang fails to provide a disclosure of the aforementioned claims adequate to support a rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102. If Examiner persists in the application of Chang as a reference that teaches these limitations, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to point out, with particularity, how the cited portions of Chang anticipate the aforementioned limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 9. Applicant respectfully submits that a final rejection of the pending claims is improper until Examiner has provided the requested information and Applicant has had an opportunity to respond to Examiner’s characterization of the art of record.

In addition to the limitations discussed above, independent claim 9 recites limitations relating to a wirelessly enabled host and a wireless interface unit. Chang is completely silent about a wireless host or a wireless interface unit. Therefore, in addition to

the omissions discussed above, Applicant submits that this is a further basis supporting Applicant's contention that Examiner has failed to provide a sufficient reference to anticipate the aforementioned limitations of independent claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable over the art of record. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all pending dependent claims are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
February 1, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary W. Hamilton/

Gary W. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 31,834